	ı i	
	Case 1:02-cv-05251-REC-TAG Docu	ment 40 Filed 07/15/05 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	NICHOLAS E. PHILLIPS,)) 1:02-CV-F-05251-REC-TAG HC
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (Doc. 1) ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER JUDGMENT
13	V.	
14		
15	G. J. GIURBINO, Warden,	
16	Respondent.	
17	Detition on is a state unicomon una cond	ling and go with a matition for whit of halons comme
18	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus	
1920	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 29, 2005, the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case filed a Report and	
21	Recommendations recommending that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be DENIED. (Doc. 36).	
22	The Report and Recommendations was served on all parties and contained notice that any objections	
23	were to be filed within ten (10) days from the date of service of that order. Subsequently, Petitioner	
24	was granted an extension of time until June 6, 2005, within which to file his objections. (Doc. 38).	
25	On June 6, 2005, Petitioner timely filed his objections to the Report and Recommendations. (Doc.	
26	39).	
27	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a <i>de</i>	
28		
		1

novo review of the case. The court rules that the statement in the recommendation that the court must also determine whether the entire trial was fundamentally unfair or unreliable in determining ineffective assistance of counsel is not an appropriate articulation of the ineffective assistance of counsel test under the circumstances of this action. See Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362 (2000); United States v. Day, 285 F.3d 1167 (9th Cir. 2002). However, having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Petitioner's objections, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations is supported by the record and the court concurs in the conclusions set forth in the recommendation. ACCORDINGLY: 1. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is DENIED; and 2. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT for Respondent. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: July 15, 2005 /s/ Robert E. Coyle UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 1:02-cv-05251-REC-TAG Document 40 Filed 07/15/05 Page 2 of 2